

Docket No.: 12810-00318-US  
(PATENT)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

In re Patent Application of:  
Tim Jungkamp et al.

Serial No.: 10/586,500

Confirmation No.: 4602

Filed: 07/13/2006

Art Unit: 1626

For: METHOD FOR PRODUCING DINITRILES

Examiner: Joseph R. Kosack

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

MS Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Madam:

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Office Action dated September 21, 2009.

Reconsideration is specifically requested of the rejection of Claims 11-26 as unpatentable over Walter and of Claims 11-27 as unpatentable over Walter in view of Tam. In the Office Action the Examiner indicated that the prior Amendment had not pointed out how the prior art and the ordinary skill in the art does not render the process of parent Claim 11 obvious.

The present invention differs from Walter whether taken alone or in view of Tam (U.S. 5,723,641) in that the reaction sequence of the eight reaction steps (a) to (h) recited in parent Claim 11 have not been previously described in or obvious from that combination of references.

The connection plan of streams 21 and 13, comprising pentenenitriles, cis-2-pentenitrile and E-2-methyl-2-butenitrile, there being brought together in column K 9 and the subsequent distillation is said by Example 2 to yield as head product a stream 19 which contains 66% of cis-2-pentenitrile and 29% of E-2-methyl-2-butenitrile. The cis-2-